

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

ORDER

The plaintiff, Verdell Bernard Patterson (“plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #8). On February 26, 2009 the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. Shortly thereafter on March 11, 2009, the plaintiff filed a motion to appoint counsel. (Doc. #10). However, to date, the plaintiff has filed no formal objections to the Report. Objections were due on March 19, 2009.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v.

Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #8). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the complaint in this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance of service of process.

The plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel is **DENIED**. (Doc. #10).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 29, 2009
Florence, South Carolina